

|   |                        |                      |  |
|---|------------------------|----------------------|--|
| <b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b>  |  |
|   | 10/798,606             | SCHUSTER, MICHAEL J. |  |
|   | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>      |  |
|   | George L. Walton       | 3753                 |  |

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** 2<sup>nd</sup> Action Allowance

 (1) Mr. Michael J. D'Aurelio - attorney.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Mr. George L. Walton - examiner.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 29 August 2004
**Time:** 11:0 AM
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

10

Prior art documents discussed:

None

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In view of the above interview, changes were proposed and made to claim 10 to make the claim more clearer and consistent with the independent claim. Also, the correction was made to show a more definitive correlation between the prevention of the creation of a pressure head within a tube and the integration of the bowl fill valve being in a portion of the toilet fill valve. See the accompanying "Examiner's Amendment" for greater details.